**Appendix H: Reflections of Course-based Embedded Assignments Jose Vasquez**



**Lamar University – M.Ed. in Educational Technology Leadership**

## Reflections of Course-based Embedded Assignments

***Directions:*** In submitting your Course-based Embedded Assignment located in Appendix I of the Internship Handbook, you are required to complete a reflection of the identified assignments in your course wiki/e-portfolio. These reflections will be used to assist you in completing your EDLD 5388/5370 (\*Please note that course number changes in Fall 2010\*) Internship comprehensive exam final report. Students should use and cite their textbook references as well as two additional references when writing each reflection. The reflection must consist of statements regarding the knowledge you gained from the assignment and how the assignment helped you master the Technology Facilitator Standard(s) /Indicator(s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Number: | Course Name: | Course-based Embedded Hours(see Appendix I) |
| **EDLD 5335** | **Curriculum Management** | **10 Hours** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Description of theAssignment/Performance Tasks(see Appendix I) | a. Analyze state-generated data and a Campus Improvement plan for the purpose of decision-making.  b. Apply the principles of learner-centered instruction and data-based decision-making in the organization of a staff development session. |
| * The knowledge you gained from the assignment. (2 points) * The relation of new information to Technology Facilitator Standards and Performance Indicators (2 points). * The relation of information gained to personal experience. (2 points) * Discussion at a critical level, not just recitation of facts. Discussion at a critical level means discussing things such as your opinion of the reading or experience, why you hold that onion, what you see wrong with the reading or experience, how you see the reading or experience is consistent or inconsistent with what you have learned so far, implications for the future, (4 ) * Insights into the patterns of interactions of colleagues.(2 points) * Group processes including: who had power, authority, or influence; who was participating and who was not, who was not included, how did you or another leader draw the silent participants out; was there confrontation, conflict, consensus, agreement, hurt feelings? (2 points) * Notations addressing the affective or feeling tone evident, concerns you noticed. (2 points) * Questions you have that you should research or about which you can seek expert advice from your campus-based supervisor or your professor. (2 points) * Issues that puzzle you. (2 points) | Data driven decision-making is probably the most important concept learned not just in this course but also throughout all of my courses in the Educational Technology program. I noticed it was a revolving theme in all the courses and is deemed the start for any research or project I engaged in. It will also be the driving force for all my future projects including the leading of professional development and technology planning. It seems appropriate that I credit this assignment for the learning experience I received. Curriculum Management is one of those courses I wasn’t too excited about. Just the name alone made me irk inside because I knew it had nothing to do with technology. However, I was surprised to see how the activities in this course actually could help me as a technology facilitator and leader. The first activity required us to analyze AEIS data and compare it to the latest campus improvement plan. This was the first time I had ever compared these two equally important documents. In the proceeding week, I created a plan for a staff development session that addressed areas of concern derived from these two documents.  The staff development planning process was quite a challenge but rewarding nonetheless. Planning for a single activity was very time consuming however it gave me a glimpse and practice for things to come. In my next step of my career, I hope to become an instructional technology specialist and I know for a fact that a major role of that job is to provide teachers with top-notch professional development. By analyzing data, I was able to brainstorm ideas on how I could address issues. I reviewed the data and discovered that students have struggled historically in math and science. I believe the data or numbers are important but did not provide me with the entire story. I decided to gather additional data by interviewing several math and science teachers. Just in the interviews alone, I was able to generate more detail and information about student achievement better than any report could. There was something important to be learned about interviewing teachers; they hold very important information that is ten times more valuable than any report. The science teachers were of most help. Based on teacher responses, I narrowed down the attributes of low performing students to two main sources. One, students do not understand science concepts and key terms. Second, the students did not enjoy learning these concepts and key terms. I realized that these two sources go hand in hand. Basically, students do not like learning science key terms and concepts because of the way it was being taught to them. Teachers expressed that they tried using interactive journals and flip charts and types of manipulative but have not had much success in engaging students. First thing that came to my mind was technology and engagement. I think interactive journals are a great idea however in conjunction with technology, the effect could be greatly improved.  As a result of this knowledge, I started on my staff development plan to address these issues. In fact, I realized that in development these activities I was addressing technology facilitation standard II, “providing teachers with models of the types of technology uses desired in classrooms” and “immersing teachers in professional learning experiences similar to the learning experiences they are expected to design” (Williamson & Redish, 2009, p. 41). What I wanted for my teachers and students is more use of technology, especially the mobile and traditional labs. My staff development plan included training for teachers on two specific Web 2.0 tools that could be used to help students understand basic concepts and key terms. The first tool was Gliffy.com, an online diagram and flowchart creator. The other was a similar service by Bubbl.us, a free brainstorm and mind map service. Other tools I suggested were online flash card maker such as flashcardmachine.com. In the actual planning template of the staff development activity I addressed the student needs according to the latest campus improvement plan. I believe that Gliffy.com, a web based tool that allows users to create great looking diagrams, flowcharts, Venn diagrams, organizational charts, etc., can assist in engaging students in the science curriculum as well as help them learn essential concepts and ideas that previously were not being learned due to lack of interest. According to the campus improvement plan, specifically Goal 1 Objective 3 Strategy 9, campus leaders were interested in seeing an improvement in vocabulary and concept acquisition. In respect to the Learner-Centered Psychological Principles, the Gliffy and Bubble.us activities along with others, would be useful in helping students construct knowledge in a meaningful way, use technology to create a relevant learning tool for knowledge acquisition and the opportunity to work with in pairs/groups to accomplish a task. This is most commonly referred to as the “social influences on learning”(American Psychological Association, 1997).  Also, according to Pitler, Hubbell, Kuhn & Malenoski (2007), using online diagram and organization software can “give teachers and students ways to create a variety of descriptive patterns to build conceptual understanding of everything from new vocabulary words to complex systems” (p. 93). I knew when I had read that research, these were the exact tools teachers needed in the classroom to engage their students and help them learn concepts and key terms in a technology enriched environment.  Looking back at the professional development plan I created in this course several months ago, I feel that I used appropriate data such as AEIS, CIP and interviews to develop activities that support my personal and campus goals to improve learning. In the future I see myself create extensive professional development plans using district data rather than campus data to address major educational needs. The biggest concern I have is how the teachers will perceive this type of training. Will they embrace it and think it is beneficial to their classroom learning activities or will they resist it and will retract back to their old teaching methods? Will teachers take it seriously or will they perceive these types of trainings as a waste of time? I think teachers will be excited to learn about these technologies for classroom use however that will depend on how much time and effort I put into the planning, research and development of the professional development activities.  Sources:  Learner-Centered Psychological Principles. (1997). American Psychological Association. Retrieved October 26, 2011, from www.apa.org/ed/governance/bea/learner-centered.pdf  Pitler, H., Hubbell, E., Kuhn, M., Malenoski, K. (2007). Using technology with classroom instruction that works. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.  Williamson, J., & Redish, T. (2009). ISTE's technology facilitation and leadership standards: what every K-12 leader should know and be able to do. Eugene,OR: International Society for Technology in Education. |